UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,826	09/17/2003	Kay Ellen Mitchell	2413/SPRI.106167	5428

32423 7590 03/21/2008

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER	
TANG, KENNETH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,826	MITCHELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KENNETH TANG	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 16-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 16-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment on 12/20/07. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not found to be persuasive. In addition, Applicant's amendment to the claims has prompted new grounds of rejections.

2. Claim 15 has been cancelled by the Applicant. Claims 1-14 and 16-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 8 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Conway (US 2003/0236777 A1).

4. As to claim 1, Conway teaches in a communications-networking environment, a method for automatically presenting the progress of a transaction (monitoring transaction with real-time feedback) (see Abstract and Figs. 5 & 6), comprising:

receiving a transaction that requires completing one or more substeps (transaction may be sent to and received from the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request; the transaction process consists of one or more instructions, which are substeps of the

transaction process) ([0037], [0028]), wherein a substep is a process to be performed in an execution of the transaction ([0019], Fig. 6); and

without user interaction (Such a transaction between an end-user and host occurs in real-time without the need for manual intervention) ([0007]), communicating to one or more display devices one or more indications (status) respectively related to said one or more substeps as said one or more substeps are performed (instant messages regarding the status and results of a transaction are sent) ([0037]).

5. As to claim 8, Conway teaches one or more computer-readable storage media having computer-useable instructions embodied (A Storage Device 212 is used to store data and programs within Computer System 200) ([0023]) thereon for automatically providing real-time transaction-progression status updates (monitoring transaction with real-time feedback) (see Abstract and Figs. 5 & 6), said method comprising:

receiving a transaction, wherein the execution of the transaction involves performing one or more subprocesses (transaction may be sent to and received from the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request; the transaction process consists of one or more instructions, which are substeps of the transaction process) ([0037], [0028]);

generating a plurality of status indicators as said one or more subprocesses progress (instant messages regarding the status and results of a transaction are sent) ([0037]); and

dynamically communicating one or more of said plurality of status indicators to a broadcasting device, whereby said plurality of status indicators can be sent to said one or more receiving components (real-time feedback - instant messages regarding the status and results of a

transaction are sent and can be read through a web portal on a single or plurality of data terminals) ([0037], [0039], [0007], Abstract).

6. As to claim 19, Conway teaches a computer system having a processor and a memory for asynchronously monitoring network transactions in real time (asynchronous transaction management with real-time feedback of transaction status) ([0022]), the system comprising:

a first user-interface component for submitting one or more transaction requests (information can be entered from a web page/web portal) ([0007], [0024]);

a transaction-processing system for receiving said one or more transaction requests, monitoring the transaction request(s) progression toward completion, and providing updates related to said progression (transaction may be sent to and received from the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request; the transaction process consists of one or more instructions, which are substeps of the transaction process) ([0037], [0028]); and

a second user-interface component - which can be said first interface component - for receiving said one or more updates and simultaneously presenting said updates, which can be related to distinct transactions (real-time feedback: Internet web page/web portal from either a single or plurality of various computers/data terminals) ([0007], [0024], [0037], Abstract).

7. As to claim 20, Conway teaches wherein the transaction-processing system identifies a plurality of events that are accomplished as said transaction progresses toward completion (transaction record is monitored until a finalized transaction status is detected (see Abstract, [0034], [0045]).

8. As to claim 21, Conway teaches wherein said second user-interface component presents said updates on a display device (displaying the transaction status or the processed transaction, such as a web page where the status/results of requested transactions are posted and updated) ([0037]).

9. As to claim 22, Conway teaches wherein said second user-interface component includes functionality to view a historical log of said updates (displays transaction status/results or processed transaction on a webpage or transaction record) ([0037], [0026]).

10. As to claim 23, Conway teaches in a networking environment, a method for performing transaction updates asynchronously (asynchronous transaction management with real-time feedback of transaction status) ([0022]) comprising:

receiving from a user a request to execute one or more transactions (user requests) ([0009]-[0010]);

withholding processing control from said user while communicating said one or more transactions to a transaction receiver (user control is withheld until there is need for manual/user/external intervention) ([0007], [0012]); and

returning processing control to said user incident to completing communication of said one or more transactions to said transaction receiver but prior to the execution of said one or more transactions (manual/external intervention from the user is prompted and returned back to the user only when the request is not finalized or not successful) ([0012], [0037]).

11. In summary, Conway teaches user requests to execute one or more transactions with real-time feedback. Transactions are monitored in real-time and automatic (without user interaction) until the user is prompted to take manual intervention (when transaction is not finalized or is unsuccessful). At this point, processing control is returned back to the user.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentacle over Conway (US 2003/0236777 A1) in view of Dugan et al. (hereinafter Dugan) (US 6,363,411 B1).

As to claim 2, Conway teaches wherein said transaction includes implementing a database update (Database 130 is updated) ([0036], [0028], [0031]). Conway is silent in modifying call-routing instructions associated with a telecommunications network. However, Dugan teaches a communications networking environment such as a telecommunications network that modifies call-routing instructions so that service components can be distributed to selected nodes (see Abstract, Fig. 2-3, col. 62, lines 37-67, col. 63, lines 1-15, col. 64, lines 20-40). Conway and Dugan are analogous art because they both are in the same field of endeavor of network-communication systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify Conway's communication network such that it would be like Dugan's Intelligent

communications network that modifies call-routing instructions. The suggestion/motivation would have been to be able to process services for any type of call received at a resource complex or switching platform. In addition, it would provide location-independent communications and thus eliminates the need for specialized service nodes and attains cost reduction (col. 6, lines 1-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references of Conway and Dugan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

13. As to claim 3, Conway teaches wherein receiving a transaction includes suspending user control until said transaction is received (user control is withheld until there is need for manual/user/external intervention) ([0007], [0012]) but prior to when said transaction is completed (manual/external intervention from the user is prompted and returned back to the user only when the request is not finalized or not successful) ([0012], [0037]).

14. As to claim 4, Conway teaches wherein communicating said one or more indications include communicating the indications to a device other than the device from which the transaction request was submitted (communicated to the Message Center 170 and not just the requesting agent) ([0037]).

15. As to claim 5, Conway teaches wherein communicating said one or more indications include communicating indications corresponding to disparate transactions to one or more display devices (instant messages regarding the status and results of a transaction may be sent to

the transacting agent or a wireless communication method may be used to update the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request) ([0037]).

16. As to claim 6, Conway teaches wherein said indications respectively related to said two or more substeps correspond to one or more of the following events:

when a transaction is submitted ([0009], [0012], [0024]);

when a transaction is received ([0029]);

when a transaction is validated;

when a transaction is accepted;

when a transaction is reformatted (reformatted by the CRM system controller 160) ([0048]);

when a transaction is sent to one or more network devices (see Abstract, [0003], [0006]); and/or

when one or more messages from said one or more network devices are received ([0007], [0032]).

17. As to claim 7, Conway teaches wherein said indications include a description of said respective event (real-time reports as to a transaction status or real-time feedback) (see Abstract, [0022]).

18. Claims 9-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conway (US 2003/0236777 A1).

As to claim 9, Conway teaches a database-update request (Database 130 is updated based on submitted host requests) ([0036], [0028], [0031]). Although Conway does not explicitly state having a table-modification request, it is well known that a database can use a data structure such as a table in order to hold its data in an organized fashion. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to have the Database 130 contain one or more tables in order to hold its data. Thus, when there is a request for database 130 to be updated, there is a request for the database table to be updated/modified.

19. As to claim 10, Conway teaches wherein generating a plurality of status indicators include generating an indication of one or more of the following events:

when a transaction is submitted ([0009], [0012], [0024]);

when a transaction is received ([0029]);

when a transaction is validated;

when a transaction is accepted;

when a transaction is reformatted (reformatted by the CRM system controller 160) ([0048]);

when a transaction is sent to one or more network devices (see Abstract, [0003], [0006]); and/or

when one or more messages from said one or more network devices are received ([0007], [0032]).

20. As to claim 11, Conway teaches wherein said plurality of status indicators include a description of said respective event (real-time reports as to a transaction status or real-time feedback) (see Abstract, [0022]).

21. As to claim 12, Conway teaches wherein dynamically communicating one or more of said plurality of status indicators are accomplished without user intervention (real-time feedback - Such a transaction between an end-user and host occurs in real-time without the need for manual intervention) ([0007], Abstract).

22. As to claim 13, Conway teaches wherein dynamically communicating one or more of said plurality of status indicators include sending indicator(s) associated with unique transactions simultaneously (real-time feedback - instant messages regarding the status and results of a transaction may be sent to the transacting agent or a wireless communication method may be used to update the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request; transaction processing requests can be made concurrently) ([0037], [0008], see Abstract).

23. As to claim 14, Conway teaches in a communications networking environment, a system for monitoring transaction progression in real time (See Abstract), the system comprising:

a request-receiving component that receives an incoming transaction (Host 150) ([0029])

a status-monitoring component (Message Center 170 or Transaction Manager 140) - coupled to said request-receiving component (Host 150) - that monitors the progression of said transaction and provides feedback related to the status of the transaction's progression toward completion (real-time feeback: transaction may be sent to and received from the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request.) ([0030], [0037], [0045], [0007], [0028]); and

a status-transmission component (Web session 110/Web portal) for receiving said feedback and communicating said feedback to one or more receiving devices (Computer system(s) 200) ([0007], Fig. 1, 110, 200, 170, 150, etc.).

Conway does teach a database-update request (Database 130 is updated based on submitted host requests) ([0036], [0028], [0031]). Although Conway does not explicitly state having a table-modification request, it is well known that a database can use a data structure such as a table in order to hold its data in an organized fashion. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to have the Database 130 contain one or more tables in order to hold its data. Thus, when there is a request for database 130 to be updated, there is a request for the database table to be updated/modified.

24. As to claim 16, Conway teaches wherein said request-receiving component retains processing control while receiving said incoming transaction (user control is withheld until there is need for manual/user/external intervention) ([0007], [0012]) but releases processing control prior to final execution of said transaction (manual/external intervention from the user is

prompted and returned back to the user only when the request is not finalized or not successful) ([0012], [0037]).

25. As to claim 17, Conway teaches wherein the status-monitoring component identifies a plurality of events that are accomplished as said transaction progresses toward final execution (transaction record is monitored until a finalized transaction status is detected) (see Abstract, [0034], [0045]).

26. As to claim 18, Conway teaches wherein the plurality of events include one or more of:

submitting a transaction to process ([0009], [0012], [0024]);

receiving a transaction ([0029]);

validating a transaction;

accepting a transaction;

sending a transaction to one or more network devices (see Abstract, [0003], [0006]); and

receiving one or more responses from said network devices ([0007], [0032]).

Response to Arguments

27. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during

prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

28. Regarding claim 1, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 1. Conway discloses that "[t]he Transaction Manager 140 transmits the formatted transactions to the host 150. A host is a unit that includes at least one processor and one or more instructions associated with a process performed by the host." Conway does not disclose a transaction with substeps as required by Applicants' claimed invention. Conway does not even disclose a transaction process. No language in Conway discloses this terminology. Conway only discloses a host which is a hardware device. This hardware device has a processor and software instructions associated with the process performed by the hardware device. Nothing in this language pertains to any transaction. Conway discloses how the host (hardware device) operates. Conway says nothing as to how the transaction is divided and processed as substeps. To be clearer, Applicants further limit claim 1 by adding the limitation "wherein a substep is a process to be performed in an execution of the transaction." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be removed. Even if the Examiner's position is taken that the one or more instructions are substeps, Conway does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention. If the instructions are substeps, the Examiner has to show anticipation by showing that one or more indications related to the one or more instructions are communicated to display devices. So, when each instruction is executed, an indication has to be provided to the display devices. Conway does not and cannot teach an indication being provided to display devices for an executed instruction. Anticipation cannot occur in an isolated vacuum. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be removed.

In Conway, the transaction does refer to processes as substeps. In Fig. 6, Conway shows the processes occurring as part of a transaction (Fig. 6 and [0019]). Therefore, Conway does teach the substep being a process to be performed in an execution of the transaction.

29. Applicant's arguments (page 12 of the Remarks) with respect to claim 2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

30. Applicant argues (page 12 of the Remarks) with respect to claim 3 that Conway does not teach "receiving a transaction includes suspending user control until said transaction is received but prior to when said transaction is completed." Conway teaches that an end-user sends a transaction to a host to be processed. The host processes the transaction and returns the result to the end-user via the Internet. See paragraph [0007] in Conway. In addition, Conway teaches that if the host is unavailable or cannot complete the transaction due to issues other than unavailability, the transaction is not completed. Manual or external intervention is needed as the Examiner states in the Office Action. See paragraph [0012] in Conway. Consequently, the disclosure in Conway does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention. First, there is nothing in Conway that discloses user control being suspended. The operative word is "suspending". The Examiner must give patentable weight to the term. There is nothing in Conway that prevents the end-user from performing a second or third transaction after the first transaction is started. Secondly, any use of manual intervention is inconsistent with claim 1 which requires "without user interaction". That requirement carries over to dependent claim 3. Conway discloses manual intervention which is contrary to Applicants' claimed invention. Thirdly, Conway discloses a transaction that is complete. When the results are returned to the end-user, this is evidence of a completed transaction. Applicants' claimed invention requires that user control only be suspended for a time before the completion of the transaction, not with the completion and not after the completion. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 be removed.

Conway teaches the suspension to be when the user control is withheld. Conway teaches the capability of both automatic and manual execution. In certain situations of Conway's invention, manual intervention may not be necessary at all. Applicant's argument is more specific than the scope of the claims require. Therefore, Conway reads on the broadest reasonable interpretation of claim 3.

31. Applicant argues for at least the above reasons, claim 4 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be removed.

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 was found to be unpersuasive. Since no arguments have been made regarding claim 4, it is also found to be unpersuasive.

32. Regarding claim 5, Conway does not teach "communicating indications corresponding to disparate transactions to one or more display devices." Conway discloses at paragraph [0037] "instant messages regarding the status and results of a transaction may be sent to the transaction agent or a wireless communication method may be used to update the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request. This language in Conway indicates that Applicants' claimed invention is not anticipated. Applicants' claimed invention requires communicating indications related to disparate transactions. Conway only discusses one transaction. Disparate transactions require separate distinct transactions. Conway does not disclose providing indications nor statuses pertaining to separate distinct transactions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be removed.

The plain meaning of the term "disparate" is defined merely as "different." Thus, Conway does disclose disparate/different transactions because it provides real-time feedback to more than one transaction (see Conway, [0037], "all submitted transactions"). Therefore, Conway's teachings satisfy the broadest reasonable interpretation of claim 5. Applicant's argument is more specific than the claim requires. Applicant's argument has been fully considered but was not found to be persuasive.

33. Applicant argues that regarding claim 6, Conway does not teach "two or more substeps". Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 be removed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

34. Applicant argues that for at least the above reasons, claim 7 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 be removed.

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 was found to be unpersuasive. Since no arguments have been made regarding claim 7, it is also found to be unpersuasive.

35. Applicant argues regarding claim 8, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 8. The same reasons traversing the rejection provided above for claim 1 are applicable here. Conway does not disclose a transaction with subprocesses as required by Applicants' claimed invention. Conway does not even disclose a transaction process. Conway does not and cannot teach an indication being provided to display devices for an executed instruction. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 be removed.

Applicant is directed to the response to the rejection of claim 1.

36. Applicant argues regarding claim 9, Conway does not teach "wherein receiving a transaction includes receiving two or more...". Conway does not teach "a table-modification request", "a LERG (Local Exchange Routing Guide) update", nor "a network-device-configuration change". Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 be removed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In addition, the Examiner notes that the Applicant has acknowledged that LERG updates are well known in the art (page 9, [0031] of the Specification).

37. Applicant argues for at least the above reasons, claims 10-12 depend from claim 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-12 be removed.

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 8 was found to be unpersuasive. Since no arguments have been made regarding claims 10-12, they are also found to be unpersuasive.

38. Applicant argues regarding claim 13, Conway does not teach "sending indicators(s) associated with unique transactions simultaneously." The reasoning provided above for claim 5 is applicable here. Applicants' claimed invention requires communicating status indicators related to unique transactions. Conway only discusses one transaction where instant messages are sent for one transaction. Unique transactions equates to separate distinct transactions. Conway does not disclose providing indications nor statuses pertaining to separate distinct transactions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be removed.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., unique transactions equates to separate distinct transactions) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant's arguments are more specific than the current scope of the claims.

39. Applicant argues regarding claim 14, Conway does not teach "wherein said incoming transaction includes two or more...". Conway does not teach "a call-routing modification associated with a telecommunication network", "a table-modification request", "a LERG (Local Exchange Routing Guide) update", nor "a network-device-configuration change". Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 be removed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Furthermore, it is noted that the limitation of "for receiving said feedback and communicating said feedback to one or more receiving devices" (last two lines) is not given any patentable weight due to the intended use language. The claimed "status-transmission component" is capable of performing the above limitation and only the "status-transmission component" is given patentable weight because if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (see MPEP 2106).

40. Applicant argues regarding claim 16, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 16. The same reasons traversing the rejection provided above for claim 3 are applicable here. There is nothing in Conway that discloses the request-receiving component retaining processing control while receiving an incoming transaction. The Examiner stated in the Office Action for independent claim 14 that the request-receiving component is Host 150 in Conway. As such, Conway does not disclose the Host 150 retaining processor control. Host 150 cannot be used to

anticipate request-receiving component in the independent claim 14 and totally ignored in dependent claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be removed.

Applicant is directed to the response to the argument for claim 3. In addition, Conway teaches the limitation the Host 150 retaining processing control by withholding the user control until there is a need for manual/user/external intervention ([0007], [0012]). In other words, the system can work as a combination of both automatically (without user) and manually by the user. Execution is automatic up until the point where the request is not finalized. When this occurs, the system can allow for manual intervention from the user. Therefore, the rejection made by the Examiner is proper.

41. Applicant argues for at least the above reasons, claims 17-18 depend from claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17-18 be removed.

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 14 was found to be unpersuasive. Since no arguments have been made regarding claim 17-18, they are also found to be unpersuasive.

42. Applicant argues regarding claim 19, Conway does not teach "a first user-interface component", "a transaction-processing system" and "a second user-interface component" bundled into one computer system. Conway does not disclose a computer system with all of the elements of claim 19. For example, a web page or web portal in Conway is not part of a computer system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 be removed.

Applicant's argument is more specific than the scope of the claims require. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed "computer system" could possibly include, for example, a plurality of clients wherein the claimed processor is located on one of the clients, while the claimed memory is located on another client. Applicant's interprets the scope of the claim to

have “a first user-interface component”, “a transaction-processing system” and “a second user-interface component” to be a single client computer. However, this is more narrow than the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Therefore, the web page or web portal in Conway is in fact part of the “computer system.” Thus, the rejection of claim 19 is proper.

Furthermore, it is noted that the limitations of “for submitting one or more transaction requests” (lines 4-5), “for receiving said one or more transaction requests, monitoring the transaction request(s) progression toward completion, and providing updates related to said progression” (lines 6-8), and “which can be said first interface component – for receiving said one or more updates and simultaneously presenting said updates, which can be related to distinct transactions.” (lines 9-11) are not given any patentable weight due to the intended use and non-positive language. The claimed “first user-interface component”, “transaction-processing system", and "second user-interface component" are capable of performing the above limitations and only the “first user-interface component”, “transaction-processing system", and "second user-interface component" terms are given patentable weight because if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (see MPEP 2106).

43. Applicant argues for at least the above reasons, claims 20-22 depend from claim 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20-22 be removed.

Applicant’s arguments regarding claim 19 was found to be unpersuasive. Since no arguments have been made regarding claim 20-22, they are also found to be unpersuasive.

44. Applicant argues regarding claim 23, Conway does not teach "withholding processing control from said user" nor "returning processing control to said user". The same reasons

traversing the rejections provided above for claims 3 and 16 are applicable here. Conway teaches that an end- user sends a transaction to a host to be processed. The host processes the transaction and returns the result to the end-user via the Internet. See paragraph [0007] in Conway. There is nothing in Conway that discloses withholding processing control. There is nothing in Conway that prevents the end-user from performing a second or third transaction after the first transaction is started. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 23 be removed.

Applicant is directed to the response to the arguments for claims 3 and 16. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not found to be persuasive.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- **JP2003337880A** discloses a business process progress management method in commercial transaction, involves providing log and progress information related to business process after processing information according to request of company (see English Abstract translation).
- **JP2002109168A** discloses a transactions management system for e-commerce, judges whether modification of process data is possible by analyzing progress information and log information of each processing unit (see English Abstract translation).
- **JP2000348111A** discloses workpiece flow management for computer, involves controlling and managing progress condition operation by determining transaction in operating unit to start transaction (see English Abstract translation).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KENNETH TANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

Kt
3/12/08